

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of March 28, 2006 is respectfully requested.

It is initially noted that claims 1-17 and 25-26 have now been canceled and replaced with new claims 28-45. Of these claims, claims 35-37 and 41 are withdrawn as being directed to non-elected embodiments. The remaining claims correspond to the elected embodiment.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 17 and 25 have been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

The claims are rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Takashige, JP 2001-210998. It is not clear which claims the Examiner considers to be anticipated by Takashige from the Office Action. However, claims 1, 11 and 12 were further rejected as being unpatentable over Iwasa, JP 2000-261193 and Nishikawa, JP 7074497. However, all of the claims under consideration at this time clearly distinguish over these references cited by the Examiner.

The new claims noted above and now under consideration include two independent claims, claims 27 and 44. Claim 27 corresponds generally to original claim 1, but includes the additional limitations of the first and second adhesive holding regions not overlapping each other and being capable of holding the circuit board in cooperation, and further recites that the first adhesive holding region and the second adhesive holding region are arranged parallel to the surface of the main body.

As described in the specification, an object of the invention is to provide a technique that facilitates the handling of a circuit board that is retained through adhesion. By providing a holding surface composed of two adhesive holding regions having different levels of tackiness, the handling of a circuit board is facilitated. As discussed in paragraph 21 on page 11 of the specification, one advantage of this arrangement is that a first adhesive holding region 21 having a relatively low tackiness is an area in which a screen mask 522 is applied. The screen mask 522 is thus only weakly adhered to the first adhesive holding region 21 during printing, which facilitates contact and parting between the screen mask 522 and the pallet 1a.

In citing the Japanese publication to Takashige, the Examiner cited a first adhesive holding region as an upper layer adhesion material 2 when that adhesion material 2 is formed in drawing 11

as a lamination of two layers. The Examiner further cited a second adhesive holding region as a lower layer of the adhesion material 2. Looking at drawing 11 of Takashige, it is clear that these layers are superimposed layers of adhesion material 2 and thus are not first and second adhesive holding regions as described in claim 28.

The Examiner further cited the Japanese publication to Iwasa as having a first adhesive holding region 3b and a second adhesive holding region 3a. However, again, as described by Iwasa reference number 3 is a double-sided tape having a high adhesive side 3a and a low adhesive side 3b. Thus, the two separate adhesive sides are necessarily superimposed. Thus, Iwasa does not meet the limitations of claim 27 either.

The same limitations are present in claim 44, and thus serve to distinguish over both Takashige and Iwasa.

There are a number of further positions set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action regarding the applicability of the references. Applicants reserve all their rights to traverse and argue against all such positions as may become necessary at a later point in time. Even if not specifically addressed, no acquiescence to any other such positions should be taken from this response.

Specific points that may be noted at this time are as follows. The Examiner cites Takashige as disclosing "silicone rubber" as the adhesive. However, the English language abstract accompanying the reference appears to be silent on this point. Further, it is not clear that there are different surface undulation characteristics imparted. Nor is it clear that there are different surface coarsenesses applied. The Examiner alleges that the first adhesive holding region and the second adhesive holding region inherently are provided within one plane. However, this appears to be clearly incorrect from the Examiner's description of Fig. 11. Nor are the adhesive holding regions confined within each other. Nor does there appear to be any disclosure of polyurethane rubber or fluorine rubber as the adhesive material.

The Examiner's discussion in the last paragraph on page 5 of the Office Action, it is submitted, does not make sense in the context.

The Examiner cited Nishikawa as disclosing a through hole 4 for receiving a pin 5, but it does not resolve the defects in the references to Takashige and Iwasa as discussed above.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now into consideration clearly distinguish over the references that have been cited. Indication of such is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is requested to pass the case to issue. If the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Tatsuki NOGIWA et al.

By: 

Nils E. Pedersen  
Registration No. 33,145  
Attorney for Applicants

NEP/kg  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
July 10, 2006